



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

producers shall always be producing at a loss? And if so, why will they go on producing?

It is to be hoped the authors will go farther with their constructive proposals, and will show toward their own plan the same hard-headed sanity which they display in visualizing and criticizing the programmes of socialism. In particular some attention should be paid to the importance of the marginal producer and to the fact that there are different kinds of unemployment, some being inevitable and some positively beneficial. Altogether, the book contains much sound sense, together with numerous statements which appear to be *non sequiturs*. There seems to be a peculiar quality in economic theorizing whereby persons who would not be far apart on tangible and clearly defined issues, can manage to clash irreconcilably in the realm of the concepts they have builded, wherein they do not even talk each others' language. Economists will not accept the Wallis theory of profits in its present form—probably they will not agree that the book contains a consistent theory—yet there is something here which may prove to be worth following up. A system of industry in which the available stock of energy cannot be fully and steadily utilized without giving labor a larger share of the output than the system will permanently permit; and which knows no better cure than chronic unemployment; and a labor market warped and demoralized by this fact—these sound suspiciously like fair characterizations of one of the worst features of modern industrialism.

J. M. CLARK

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*The Farm Bureau Movement.* By O. M. KILE. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921. Pp. 282.

This is a timely and illuminating volume from a man who by virtue of his official connection has been privileged to secure a particularly intimate view of the national farm bureau organization. In spite of this former connection and the friendly introduction by President Howard of the American Farm Bureau Federation, this book is not, so the reviewer is informed, to be regarded as an official statement nor is it accepted at headquarters as an entirely satisfactory exposition of the matter. However, it may be commended to the mass of readers as being a broader, more accurate, and more comprehensive description and analysis of the movement than is ordinarily to be secured so early in the history of great popular movements of this sort.

The book in one sense is distinctly more than its title promises since it is not merely a discussion of the farm bureau but devotes something like one-third of its pages to a discussion of farm organization movements in general before the birth of the farm bureau idea, and considerable space elsewhere in the book is given to the discussion of contemporary farm organizations for the sake of comparison with the farm bureau. This historical approach to the problem makes for temperateness and breadth of view even though the material itself has been picked up at second hand and shows no very thorough knowledge or profound understanding of some of the issues presented.

The book, in another sense, is rather less than its title promises. The "farm bureau movement" consists not alone of the American Farm Bureau Federation but also of a large number of state federations and a yet larger number of county farm bureaus and township or other local groups. In the curious process of its evolution the movement also has acquired an intimate, though somewhat ambiguous, connection with the agricultural extension service of the various agricultural colleges and of the United States Department of Agriculture. State sovereignty has been so thoroughly preserved in the case of the state federations that a considerable diversity in form of organization and type of work has been built up in the different states, thus preserving within the farm bureau movement that latitude for provincial experimentation which has so often been pointed out as a peculiar strength of political organization in the United States. Mr. Kile either has not informed himself fully concerning the depth and significance of these differences in policy within the different states or has elected to expound only that type of organization which appeals to him as being the most successful or desirable.

Likewise the dual connection of the farm bureau movement as the latest ramification of the extension idea, on the one hand, and as a rather ambitious scheme of federation into a state and national organization free from the trammels of our state educational institutions or government bureaus, on the other hand, presents a practical dilemma which is very inadequately discussed in *The Farm Bureau Movement*. This is doubtless good judgment on the part of one writing for the audience to which Mr. Kile addresses himself, but from the point of view of the student it must be admitted that it is at this very point that the future growth and successful operation of the farm bureau and federation system seems most definitely to be threatened.

Somewhat similar is the problem of the identification of the farm

bureau as such with commercial activities. In spite of the wise lessons drawn from the past, when the Grange and other farm organizations became involved in commercial ventures, Mr. Kile is the apologist for all that has been done under farm bureau auspices along commercial lines and appears to feel that the Federation should maintain some very definite suzerainty in this field. He says:

The very present danger exists that unless the Farm Bureau can develop along lines big enough and broad enough so as to make marketing merely one of its numerous important activities, it may eventually turn out that the co-operative concerns that it creates may become so large and powerful within a given territory that they will practically ignore the parent organization. In fact the American Farm Bureau Federation is not even the organic parent under the plan of organization whereby the commodity co-operative organizations are now being brought into existence. Since each commodity organization can be but sectional, there would still be great need for some overhead organization national in scope and capable of speaking for *all* the farmers, even should a complete network of commodity organizations come into existence. It will require the utmost skill of management for the Farm Bureau to establish itself so firmly in this position of leadership now that it cannot be displaced by some association of commodity organizations later [p. 274].

This question of sectionalism, barely glimpsed in the quotation above, is in fact one of the most vital issues with reference to the national plan of organization whether in the field of legislation or in that of large-scale commercial organizations such as the American Farm Bureau Federation has particularly fostered. The overlooking or evasion of this issue in the book before us is conspicuous.

The farm bureau movement is an event which bulks large enough in our national life to call for the writing of more than one book about it. Other writers, approaching it from other points of view and with a longer perspective in which to view the matter, will doubtless tell a different story and achieve possibly a truer interpretation than has been presented in this volume. Nevertheless it is a significant document and a worthy pioneer in its field. Possibly its most valuable contribution is to be found in chapter xiv, in which the writer tells us how the Federation's work at Washington looked from the angle at which he viewed it. Possibly its weakest feature is the naïveté of his notions about co-operation and the superstitious respect paid the hocus-pocus of the "Committee of Seventeen" and like bodies.

E. G. NOURSE